



TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application Number	10/073,110,
		Filing Date	02/12/2002
		First Named Inventor	Edward McGugan
		Group Art Unit	3671
		Examiner Name	PECHHOLD, Alexandra K.
Total Number of Pages in this Submission	3	Attorney Docket Number	55717/220

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)


<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts / Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below): <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;">Return Receipt Requested</div>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Remarks</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">Attached is A Response to Requirement for Restriction, due March 3, 2003.</div>		

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2003

GROUP 3600

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP per Brian W. Gray (Reg. No. 30,017) Agent of Applicant
Signature	
Date	March 3, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date: _____

Typed or printed name		
Signature	Date	

21120288.1



Atty Docket: 55717/220

HS/Electric
3/11/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

March 3, 2003

To: The Commissioner of Patents
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office
Washington, D.C., 20231 U.S.A.

Title: Slide Rail Adjustment for Grader Blade
Inventor: Edward McGugan
Filed: February 12, 2002
Serial No: 10/073,110
Art Unit: 3671
Examiner: Alexandra K. Pechhold

RECEIVED

MAR 04 2003

GROUP 3600

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

This letter is responsive to the Examiner's Office communication of February 3, 2003.

Remarks

1) Summary of Prosecution to Date

This application was originally filed with claims 1 – 16. The Examiner has now suggested that the case be restricted to claims 1 – 10 (Group I), which the Examiner characterizes as being drawn to the combination of a grader blade and a support structure; or claims 11 – 16, which the Examiner characterizes as being drawn to the sub-combination of a bearing support arrangement.

2) Traverse of Restriction Requirement

The applicant respectfully traverses this restriction requirement of the Examiner.

MPEP 806.03, first paragraph, reads as follows: "Single Embodiment, Claims Defining Essential Features – Where the claims of an application define the same essential characteristics of a *single* disclosed embodiment of an invention, restriction therebetween should never be required. This is because the claims are but different definitions of the same disclosed subject matter, varying in breadth or scope of definition."